

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE, SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-1089
TEL: (408) 414-1080
FAX: (408) 414-1076

MAR 09 2006

FAXED
3-9-06

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Fikremariam A. Yalew	Craig G. Holmes
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO - Group Art Unit No. 2136	MARCH 9, 2006
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
(571) 273-8300	4
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	50325-0616
RE:	U.S. SERIAL NUMBER:
Interview Summary	10/052,279

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Attached for facsimile filing are:

1. Interview Summary of March 9, 2006 Interview with Examiner (3 pages)
2. Facsimile Cover Sheet

Please contact Craig G. Holmes at (408) 414-1207 with any questions.
Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE AND CONFIRM RECEIPT VIA FACSIMILE AT (408) 414-1076.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT(S) NAMED ABOVE. THIS MESSAGE MAY BE AN ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION, AND AS SUCH IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR AN AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS DOCUMENT IN ERROR AND THAT ANY REVIEW, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US BY MAIL. THANK YOU.

Docket No. 50325-0616 (Seq.No. 4621)

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Chinna N. R. Pellacuru

Serial No.: 10/052,279

Filed: January 17, 2002

For: FACILITATING IPsec COMMUNICATIONS
THROUGH DEVICES THAT EMPLOY
ADDRESS TRANSLATION IN A
TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK: Confirmation No.: 4859
: Group Art Unit: 2136
: Examiner: Fikremariam A. YalewRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 09 2006

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents
Mail Stop AMENDMENT
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450By facsimile: (571) 273-8300

Sir:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview conducted on March 9, 2006. The interview was between Examiner Fikremariam Yalew and the applicant's attorney, Craig G. Holmes. Pending Claims 1 and 30 that were rejected in the Office Action were discussed along with U.S. Patent No. 6,687,245 issued to *Fangman*.

The discussion began with a description of the problem being addressed by the application, specifically how a NAT enabled router can determine which of two or more IPsec originator nodes to send each message from an IPsec responder node that each of the two or more IPsec originator nodes are communicating with. As the Applicant explained, this is a problem when two or more IPsec originator nodes are initially trying to set-up IPsec based communications with the same IPsec responder node at about the same time. In such a situation, when a response is received at the NAT enabled device from the IPsec responder

Application of Chinna N.R. Pellacuru, Ser. No. 10/052,279, Filed 01/17/2002
Interview Summary

node, the NAT enabled device is unable to determine for sure to which IPsec originator to send that message because there are two or more IPsec originator nodes waiting for a response from that same IPsec responder node.

Then the Applicant discussed the solution described in the application, namely that the IPsec responder node generates its SPI based at least in part on the corresponding IPsec originator node's SPI (e.g., by replacing the last two bytes of the responder node's SPI with the first two bytes of the originator node's SPI). As a result, the NAT enabled device can compare the portion of the responder node's SPI that is based on the originator node's SPI to a hash of the SPIs of the different originator nodes to determine which of those originator nodes the particular responder node's message should be sent. Once that is done, the NAT enabled device can make an entry in the network address translation table that properly associates the correct originator node to the responder node for each security association established between originator nodes and that same responder node.

The Applicant then explained, with reference to Claim 30 first and then Claim 1, how the claims had been amended to expressly recite the normal NAT functions so as to distinguish those functions from the steps relating to the SPIs and matching of same by the NAT enabled device. As the Applicant explained, these amendments were made due to the apparent confusion that the Applicant believed was reflected in the first Office Action in which the features of the claims were rejected based on normal address translation functions of *Fangman*. Specifically, the Applicant explained that the claims were amended to recite the network addresses of the different IPsec nodes, the network address of the NAT enabled device, and the network address translation function performed by the NAT enabled device. As a result, the Applicant hopes that claims can be more readily understood so as to distinguish the normal NAT features from the new approach of the claims regarding the generation of the responder SPIs based at least in part on the SPI of the corresponding originator nodes.

Finally, the Applicant described why the IPsec enabled NAT device for VOIP as taught by *Fangman* was different than the approaches of the Applicant's claims. Specifically, the Applicant explained that *Fangman* does not address the situations addressed by the approach of the claims, namely resolving which originator node the NAT device should send a particular response message from a responder node when the originator nodes are initially

Application of Chinna N.R. Pellacuru, Ser. No. 10/052,279, Filed 01/17/2002
Interview Summary

trying to establish different security associations with the same responder node. In particular, the Applicant explained that *Fangman* was silent about having the responder node's SPI (or identifier as in Claim 1) generated by the responder node based at least in part on the originator node's SPI and the hash algorithm (e.g., the first identifier and the specified scheme in Claim 1). The Examiner indicated that he would review the amended claims and arguments further and likely would perform another search. No agreement as to the allowability of the claims was reached.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Craig G. Holmes
Reg. No. 44,770

Date: March 9, 2006

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089

Telephone: (408) 414-1207
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

on March 9, 2006 by Trudy Bagdore